Vol. XVII, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1958

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

CONTENTS

Page

HEXAEMERON: THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE WITH THE CHURCH FATHERS 65
By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide.

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, OR RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, OR WHAT? 73
By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, Universitfy of Otago.

BOOK REVIEWS, ETC. 83

(See inside back cover)

PRICE: THREE SHILLINGS

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.
THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.
THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.
THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dunedin.
THE REV. PROFESSOR D. S. HOPKIRK, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Edinburgh.
THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.
THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the exposition of the Christian Faith. The Editors are not responsible for every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, E.2, Victoria, Australia. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:
Ten Shillings, including postage. (Foreign, 10/6; U.S.A., $1.20.)

THE
REFORMED
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XVII, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1958

Hexaemeron

Theology and Science with the Church Fathers.

In his book, *The Oriental Religions in the Roman Empire,* Franz Cumont quotes Renan's famous statement that, if the growth of Christianity in the Roman Empire during the third century had been brought to a standstill by some fatal disease, Mithraism would have become the religion of Europe. Discussing the consequences of such a development, Cumont points out that in this case European culture would never have been able to get rid of a wrong physics. "Astrology would have been indelible, and still to-day heaven would move around the earth, as that physics would require." Unbelievable as it may seem to many of our contemporaries, it is a fact that in the last analysis Christianity has saved the freedom of science to search for truth. We who have seen how easily philosophers and scientists can be enslaved by a totalitarian state understand better than former generations that all true human freedom and all serious search for truth is deeply connected with the freedom and the truth of which the New Testament speaks.

I

This may sound strange in view of the conflict between theology and science which has been going on for so many centuries. "Is the knot of history to be untied in that way that Christianity goes with barbarism and science with unbelief?" So Schleiermacher has formulated the problem confronting the modern world since the Renaissance. In point of fact this problem existed already in one of the most critical periods in the history of the Church when around 1200 Averroism began to penetrate into Christendom with its contention that wherever the authority of Aristotle clashed with the authority of religion one must follow the "philosophus." At that time Thomas Aquinas

was able to so solve the problem by building up his system which tries to render to philosophy the things that are philosophy's, and to theology that are theology's. Whatever one may think of this attempt to solve the problem, it has to be admitted that it was one of the greatest ever made, and one can well understand the deep impression it has made not only on the contemporaries of the Doctor Angelicus, but also on future generations, so much that even to-day the Roman Canon Law (CIC can. 1366,2) demands that all philosophical and theological instruction must maintain the principles of Aquinas. The Thomistic solution was possible because the Church had brought to the new nations of Europe not only the theological, but also the philosophical heritage of the Ancient culture in the midst of which it had grown up, one of the superstitious sects from the Orient, as men like Tacitus and Celsus regarded it, not to be taken seriously by anybody except the police. But soon Christianity asserted itself also in the field of philosophy and science. No one can read Origen's great apology, *Against Celsus*, without feeling the superiority of the Christian thinker. "Jesus was silent" when he was falsely accused, so Origen begins, but He was no longer silent when he was asked whether he was the Son of God. Then he replied with His great confession (Hebr. 3:1): "Ego eimi," "I am" (Mark 14:62). So the Church, this is Origen's point, cannot be silent when asked for its confession. An answer must be given in the interest of the unbelievers as well as in the interest of "him that is weak in the faith" (Rom. 14:1). Thus the encounter between Christianity and "modern science," whatever science may be just modern, takes place at all times. The encounter will assume various forms from peaceful co-existence to a cold war which may become hot, and will be very hot when the Great Inquisitors on either side will prepare the stakes for their auto-da-fes to crush the heretics of the other side.

II

One of the burning issues of these encounters and the conflicts arising from them has always been the meaning of the "Hexaemeron," the work of the six days, the story of creation in the first chapter of the Bible. Already Philo had to reconcile his philosophical ideas of the origin of the world which were mainly based on Plato's *Timaios* with the narrative of Genesis. He did so by explaining the text allegorically, as also the Christian thinkers of Alexandria later did. It is not accidental that the conflict began just in Alexandria, the centre of natural science,

and the centre of allegorical interpretation of texts with pagans, Jews and Christians. It is significant that all thinkers and Fathers who are connected with Neoplatonist Alexandria make use of the allegorical method, while the great theologians of the school of Antioch, following the Aristotelian tradition of this city, prefer the literal interpretation. As it is neither possible nor of interest to our readers to describe or to enumerate the countless attempts to interpret Gen. 1, we confine ourselves to a few documents and to two problems, the problems of time and space in the Hexaemeron.

The problem of time is posed by the "six days." But in order to understand the attempts to understand the "days" we begin with the question that arose in the 2nd century: How old is the world? John Lightfoot, one of the greatest scholars of the learned 17th century, has found out that Adam was created on 23rd October, 4004 B.C. at nine o'clock a.m. Behind this date there is a venerable tradition of Christian chronography. Our Christian era ("ab incarnatione Domini") goes back to Dionysius Exiguus in the 6th century. He assumed that Jesus was born in 754 of the Roman era (Varro's era "ab urbe condita"). Though adopted by the Church, it was not very much used. Only since 1431 the papal documents are regularly dated "ab incarnatione Domini." The splendid idea that the years before the Incarnation could be called years B.C. was conceived only in the late 17th century. Up to that time other eras had to be used. While the Jews used the Seleucidian era for many centuries, it seems to have been Julius Africanus who after 200 A.D. created for the first time an era "after the creation of the world." Still medieval chronographers accept his theory that Jesus was born 5500 years after the Creation. Several other attempts have been made. Thus in Egypt a very similar chronology was made which spread as far as Ethiopia, while the most important era was that of Byzantium which assumes that the creation began — to use our chronology — on the 1st of September, 5509 B.C. It was the official era of the East until Russia introduced the Christian era in 1700. But still around 1800 there are complaints that people in Germany are slow in accepting the way of the historians of dating the years B.C. This explains not only Lightfoot's attempt, but also the fact that the German Reformers found it desirable to investigate the question. Luther and Melanchthon arrived at dates that would correspond to our 3690 B.C. and 3963 B.C. respectively. They have been influenced by the Jewish era

which seems to go back to the 4th century, but was accepted only in the Middle Ages. The Jewish date is the 7th of October, 3761 B.C.

What does all this mean? It means that the "supputatio annorum mundi" (Luther 1541 and 1545, *W.A.* vol. 53) belongs to the sphere of private speculation. The Church has never made a dogma of the age of the world. The Byzantine era appears officially for the first time in the dating of the decrees of the Quinisextum, that synod of 692 which is for the Eastern Church a highly important supplement to the 5th and the 6th Ecumenical Synods. But the Eastern Church would never regard such assumptions as dogma, just as John of Damask in describing the Hexaemeron and giving details of the earth would not regard it as an orthodox doctrine that there are 34 provinces or countries in Europe and 48 in Asia (*De fide orthodoxa* II, 10). None of the Church Fathers would ever had admitted errors in the narrative of creation or in the Holy Scriptures as a whole. But they were far away from that biblicism or "Fundamentalism" which makes a doctrine, a dogma of every statement of the Bible and tries to understand nature and history from the Bible only. This is a grave abuse of the "sola scriptura" of the Reformation. The great freedom of the Ancient Church in interpreting the Scriptures is especially obvious in the attempts to explain the six "days" of creation. Already Celsus had seen that Gen. 1 speaks of six days, while 2:4 mentions one day. He had blamed Moses for this contradiction. Origen who gives an allegorical explanation (i.e., the light of the first day meaning the angels) teaches a simultaneous creation, the days meaning only the diversity of the things created (*Contra Celsum* VI, 50f.; 60ff.). The sumultaneousness of creation has been taught even by Athanasius (*Or. contra Arianos* II, 60; Migne PG 26; 276), and is also the doctrine of Augustine. Three times he has started explaining the Hexaemeron literally. "But each time he ended with an allegorical exegesis" (*Cath. Encyclopedia,* vol. VII, p. 315). He repeated the question of Celsus whether there could be days before there was the sun. He asked himself whether it took the whole day to create the things assigned to a special day. How the great Father has wrestled with the problem may be seen from the twelfth book of his *Confessions* where he in the sight of God — for the *Confessions* are written in the form of a prayer, and they are a prayer, a prayer of praise — discusses all the difficulties and develops his own thought without condemning those who come to different

conclusions: "So when one says, 'Moses meant as I do'; and another, 'Nay, but as I do,' I suppose that I speak more reverently, 'Why not rather as both, if both be true?' And if there be a third, or a fourth, yea if any other seeth any other truth in those words, why may not he be believed to have seen all these, through whom the one God has tempered the holy Scriptures to the senses of many who should see therein things true but divers *(Deus unus sacras litteras vera et diversa visuris multorum sensibus temperavit)?* . . . I will not therefore, O my God, be so rash, as not to believe, that Thou vouchsafedst as much to that great man (i.e., to Moses). He without doubt, when he wrote these words, perceived and thought on what truth soever we have been able to find, yea and whatsoever we have not been able, nor yet are, but which may be found in them" (*Conf.* XII [31], 42, translation by Pusey). In other words: Augustine realises the impossibility to give a full and sufficient exposition of the Hexaemeron. Submitting fully to the inerrant Word of God, he sees that the things of which it speaks are hidden in mysteries. Such a mystery which no man can solve is the mystery that human reason cannot understand the "time" in creation.

III

From the problem of *time* we turn to the problem of *space* in the Hexaemeron. Again we look at John of Damask, the Aquinas of the Eastern Church, and we look into the Hexaemera by Basilius the Great and Ambrose. Both are series of sermons on Gen. 1, preached like the homilies on Genesis by John Chrysostom (Migne PG 53) to congregations consisting of people of various degrees of education. An interesting observation may be inserted. Gen. 1:1-2:2 is the first of the "prophecies" in the Liturgy of Holy Saturday which has now become again the vigil of Easter. In the Roman breviary this lesson appears on Septuagesima Sunday. The custom goes back to the Ancient Church where in the East sermons on the Hexaemeron were preached at the beginning of Lent, while the West had these sermons at the beginning of Holy Week. This becomes quite clear from Basilius who makes repeatedly references to the fasting of his congregation which attended the sermons twice a day. It is confirmed by Chrysostom whose first homily explains the situation of the preacher as well as of his hearers who joyfully begin the Quadragesima as the beginning of a new life. For Ambrose, on the other hand "In the beginning" refers mystically to the Pascha as the beginning of the new year (Ex. 12:2). Ambrose

repeats many thoughts from Basilius. It is interesting to compare the two preachers. Throughout the Hexaemeron of Basilius one notices the Greek sense of the beauty of the world. His description of the sea is rightly regarded as one of the finest expression of that sense in Greek literature. The greatness of Ambrose lies in the solemn dignity of his speech.[1] Both praise the wisdom of the creator. Both make use of the psalms, of Job, the prophets and of the New Testament, thus taking the doctrine of creation from the entire Bible, not only from Gen. 1. Both emphasize over against the Jewish interpretation of the Bible the connection between the first and the second article of the Creed: Gen. 1:26 cannot be understood as if the Father held a monologue or addressed the angels. Here "the light of theology shines through the window" and puts the Jew and the denier of the Homoousios to shame, as Basilius points out (*Hex.* IX, 6, comp. Ambrose *Hex.* VII). For here the Father speaks to the Son who is "of one substance with the Father," "by whom all things were made." Both take issue with the pagan theories of an eternal world and with the myths of ancient cosmologies. Their criticism, however, is, as far as I can see, nowhere directed against science as such. They take over what then was regarded as the result of scientific research, e.g., in the fields of botany and zoology, mainly from Pliny. They also accept the theories concerning the structure of the universe. For Basilius the earth is a globe. He accepts this view from the science of his age. He does not blame the scientists for their theories, but for their blindness which prevents them from believing in God the creator. He would like to know with them what stars are being seen by the inhabitants of the southern hemisphere (I, 4). He leaves it to his hearers to accept or to reject the theories about what we would call the law of gravity (I, 9). This is not a matter of faith. All these Fathers know that the words "greater" and "lesser" of the lights created on the fourth day refer only to that which appears to our eyes. They know of the immense distances between earth, moon and sun. They know that stars are bigger than the moon. They do not fight ancient astronomy, but only the deification of the

---

1. Hex. V, 24 f. (88, ff.) is one of the most touching calls to repentence. Speaking of the birds, the preacher mentions the cock crowing at Peter's denial and asks for the forgiveness of his Lord: "Give me the tears of Peter, I do not want the pleasures of the sinner." Then follows the admonition which shows that this sermon is connected with the reconciliation of the sinners which took place in Milan perhaps on Maunday Thursday rather than on Good Friday.

heavenly bodies and astrology which is bound up with it. Not science, but idolatry is rejected, adoration of the creature instead of worship of the one true God, the creator.

How free from any prejudice the Fathers were, appears from a passage by John of Damask in *De fide orthodoxa:* "Some declare the earth to be a globe, others to have the shape of a cone. In any case it is lesser and much smaller than the heaven, a point, as it were, hanging in the midst of it. But also it will perish and be transformed. Blessed is he who inherits the earth of the meek (Matth. 5:5). For the earth which will receive the saints is imperishable" (II, 11). Who will say that these Fathers were bound to an antiquated view of the world, to the imagination of a flat earth with the heaven above and the hell below? These men were exactly in the same situation in which modern Christians find themselves when realising the size of the universe and trying to interpret the creation in such a way that they do not deny the facts established by scientific research which, however, are to be distinguished from the theories put forward to explain these facts. Also these men lived in a world of science. Erotosthenes had computed the circumference of the earth with an astonishing approximation. Would they have accepted also the Copernican view of the universe which made the earth move around the sun? There would not have been any reason to reject it as the Church later did with detrimental consequences. Heliocentric systems were known also to ancient scientists. At least Aristarchos of Samos who made his observations in Alexandria in 288-77 B.C. had established such a system, probably on the basis of earlier theories which he improved by means of astronomical observations and exact mathematical calculations. It was not the Church which prevented this system from being accepted. There was not yet a Church to do that, and the Ancient Church would never have done it. It was merely the overwhelming authority of Aristotle who at that time and throughout the Middle Ages made the acceptance of a heliocentric view of the world impossible. It was suggested by Nicolaus of Oresme who died in 1382. So powerful was the authority of Aristotle still at the time of the Reformation that Luther also rejected the theory of Copernicus, and soon after the Reformation Aristotle became again the philosopher of all Western Christendom in the age of Orthodoxy. This could happen, although Luther already had overcome the medieval idea of space in his "Dextera Dei ubique est," "God's right hand is everywhere," a conviction which he shares with John of

Damask who understood the right hand of God as God's glory and majesty. Both Luther and Damascenus know that God is "beyond all mathematics," as Luther puts it (we would to-day use the word physics).

IV

We cannot enter here the problem how to-day the problem presented by the Hexaemeron of the Bible must be solved. Whatever modern theology has to say, why should we not study the Fathers and learn from them? The Churches which to-day want to preserve the heritage of the Reformation must find a new approach to the Bible, and this means also a new solution of the problem of "reason and revelation." We cannot accept the solution of Thomas. Already Aquinas' great friend Bonaventura had his misgivings about the wonderful harmony which Thomas found between reason and revelation. In Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the main church of the Dominicans in Rome — what a significant name — there is to be seen the famous painting by Filippino Lippi (1489) showing the triumph of the Doctor Angelicus over Averroes. Seated on his cathedra, surrounded by scholars, he puts his foot on the vanquished Averroes and the books of the Averroists. Pointing with his right hand to the defeated foe, he holds in his left hand another book with the words *"Sapientiam sapientium perdam,"* "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise" (1 Cor. 1:19). Thomas was able to overcome Averroes at the high cost of receiving Aristotle, as far as he seemed not to contradict the Bible. However, this meant that the creation became more or less a truth of reason. Luther was right when in one of the Heidelberg Theses of 1518, the first thesis on philosophy, he says: *"Qui sine periculo volet in Aristotele philosophari, necesse est ut ante bene stultificetur in Christo."* "If one wishes to be a philosopher in Aristotle without danger, one must first become a good fool in Christ." That is what Basilius called the "light of theology" which must shine through the window. Belief in God the creator must always be belief in the Triune God. Otherwise God becomes a demiourgos, a mere artisan, or a *prima causa,* the first cause, according to Aristotle. Then the Hexaemeron loses all meaning. It becomes a mere cosmogony. Its true meaning can only be understood by him who is of one substance with the Father: *"per quem omnia facta sunt,"* "By whom all things were made."

H. SASSE.

Immortality of the Soul, or Resurrection of the Dead, or What?

In a recent study Oscar Cullmann has complained about the widespread mistake "of attributing to primitive Christianity the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul."[1] This complaint of his is entirely justified by the exegetical evidence of the New Testament, and I have no intention to enter upon a detailed discussion of it. Such passages as have sometimes been quoted in support of the view that there are at least traces of a doctrine of immortality in the New Testament refer either to an intermediate state (Lk. 16:22, 23: 43; Rev. 6:9) or to a life with Christ in the hereafter (2 Cor. 5:8, Phl. 1:22) or introduce a distinction of soul and body that has nothing in common with a Platonic dualism (Mt. 10:28). The New Testament neither regards the soul as intrinsically immortal nor does it view its relation to the body as a metaphysical calamity. Consequently, salvation is not described as the soul's deliverance from the prisonhouse of the body, but as a resurrection of the body. These are common places, and one hesitates to repeat them.

Once this is granted, certain corollaries follow. The belief in the resurrection of the body commits us to the idea that this will take place "at the end"[2] or on "the Last Day," and it further implies an "intermediate state" which the dead occupy until the parousia. Cullmann is prepared to accept both corollaries. In fact, he is wholeheartedly committeed to them. Of the End he says that it must be "understood literally, i.e., in the temporal sense,"[3] and the idea of an interim state he affirms, making it quite clear that "the transformation of the body does not occur immediately after each individual death."[4] Again, Cullmann is on sound exegetical ground, and yet, as he himself informs us, a great number of his readers have been dissatisfied with his conclusions. Why? Because *they found it hard* to accept the notion of an interim state.[5] And we might add, the notion of a "last day" in time on which our Lord will return to judge the living and the dead has become equally unacceptable to the majority of contemporary Christians. Here Cullmann has no answer. His strength is also his weakness. However secure a theologian may feel in his exegetical stronghold, he must venture out

1. **Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead**, London, 1958, p. 6.
2. op. cit 48.
3. loc. cit.
4. op. cit. 49.
5. op. cit. 10.

into the theological field and do battle. Exegesis is not identical with theology. As it is, we shall have occasion to show that even his exegetical position is not as unassailable as Cullmann thinks.

Cullmann says of the resurrection of the body, the interim state, and the parousia "It is written." Of course, "it is written." But what does that mean for us Christians of the twentieth century? Are we to take this exegetical evidence literally, or what? I have no intention to let this essay degenerate into still another discussion on the subject of demythologising. One thing, however, ought to be said in favour of demythologising, and that is that it attempts to make the Christian Faith "real" for the people of our own time. And if some Christians at any rate fasten on the Greek concept of immortality it will be for the same reason that it enables them to attach greater reality to their belief in the hereafter than the biblical belief in the resurrection of the body and all that it implies. Such straining toward reality is a good and honest thing, and it is not met by merely quoting the textual evidence against it.

On the other hand, we do not wish to do injustice to Cullmann either. He is perfectly right in saying that there is no textual basis for the Greek doctrine of immortality in the New Testament, and the fact that some find it more acceptable than the belief in the resurrection is, of course, not sufficient ground for replacing the one by the other. Does this mean that we are faced, on the one hand, with an "acceptable" but unbiblical doctrine of immortality and, on the other hand, with a biblical but "unacceptable" belief in resurrection? The answer is No on two accounts. First, the doctrine of immortality is, in fact, not as "acceptable" as it appears on first sight. It is not only unbiblical, but it is also unscientific. Henri Bergson's verdict is not too severe: "The Platonic conception of the soul has not advanced our knowledge of the soul a single step, in spite of two thousand years of meditation upon it."[6] It was but a sophisticated dressing up of primitive animism.[7] To any person who has seriously opened his mind to the findings of modern psychology, the doctrine of immortality, far from commending itself as the more "acceptable" view, has become entirely unacceptable. In fact, seen in the light of modern psychological research, the belief in resurrection has a certain advantage over the doctrine of immortality

6. **Les deux sources de la morale at de la religion** (1932), p. 282 (Quoted by J. Baillie, **And the Life Everlasting**, p. 94, n. 1).
7. cp. J. Baillie, op. cit. 82s.

in that it views mind and body as but two aspects of mortal man and consequently implies the death of the whole man and not merely one part of him. In other words, the biblical view of man is doing justice to the intimate interaction of mind and body which we cannot but accept as truth about ourselves, and it is quite realistic about death. These two points should, in fact, commend it to modern men when compared with the doctrine of immortality. But this still leaves us with the very real difficulties which the notion of an interim state and of a resurrection on the "last day" present to modern men. All that we have achieved then so far is the proof that the doctrine of immortality is not as "acceptable" as it appeared on the surface; although this has been some gain for the belief in resurrection, nothing has been gained that would more readily make us accept its distinct affirmations concerning the hereafter.

It is at this stage that I wish to challenge Cullmann's exegetical account. He has given us part of the textual evidence, but not the whole of it. Or rather, he has forced the whole evidence to suit his own view of the biblical doctrine of the hereafter. I am thinking in particular of Phl. 1:23 and 2 Cor. 5:8. Of the former, Cullmann says that it must not be quoted in support of the view "that the resurrection of the body takes place immediately after the individual death,"[8] for he believes that both passages refer to an interim state which brings the dead believers into a "special proximity to Christ."[9] We shall not waste much time over the obvious logical difficulties of such an assumption. One fails to see what being could conceivably enjoy that "special proximity" if we are to think of a being without a body and of which it must not be said that it has an immortal soul, unless one were to introduce the notion of conditional immortality. But Cullmann does not tell us that that is what he is doing.

In fact, Cullmann's exegesis of the two passages is wrong.[10] Phl. 1:23 and 2 Cor. 5:8 do not refer to an interim state. On the contrary, Paul visualises here a union with the Lord at the hour of death which is complete in every respect. This has been recognised for Phl. 1:23 by Albert Schweitzer and Ernst Lohmeyer.[11] Both scholars recognise, however, that in Phl. 1:23 Paul is not advancing views concerning the Christian hope in general, but that he is

8. op. cit. 50.
9. op. cit. 52 and 53s.
10. Also Philippe Menoud, **Le sort des trepasses**, 38.
11. **Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus**, 136 and Lohmeyer, **Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar**, ad hoc.

thinking of himself quite specifically, and that in relation to a distinct situation in which he happens to find himself. In short, he is contemplating the possibility of his own martyr death and the advantages which such a death carries with it. It will take him immediately into the presence of the Lord. It is a privilege that is not shared by those who die in the normal course of their lives. This is quite clear from what Paul says in 1 Th. 4:17. The argument there would make little sense if Paul had taught the people of Thessalonica to expect, at the hour of death, at least something approximating the advantages visualised in Phl. 1:23. As it is, far from showing any familiarity with such ideas, the Thessalonians were obviously afraid that the dead would actually be at a disadvantage on the day of the parousia, and all that Paul does to allay their fears is to point out to them that the dead will rise "first," i.e., before those who happen to be alive on that day.

One could, of course, argue that Paul's views concerning the interim state underwent a change, but there is no evidence for it. And Menoud is quite definitely wrong when he quotes 1 Th. 4:17 in support of the view that the interim state implied union with the Lord.[12] The words "And so we shall always be with the Lord" refer, in that passage, to the state after the parousia and not to a state prior to it. As a matter of fact, the letters of Paul do not lend any support to the view that his hope concerning the hereafter has undergone any fundamental change. What change there can be noticed merely concerns the date of the parousia. While in 1 Th. 4 and in 1 Cor. 15 he still expected it in his own lifetime, that expectation has receded when he wrote 2 Cor. 5 and Phl. 1.[13] But even in his letter to the Philippians his old views continue unchanged in all fundamentals, notwithstanding the hope he attaches to a martyr death. Here Menoud is right in his refusal to read into Phl. 3:20, 21 the meaning of Phl. 1:23 while Lohmeyer is wrong when he attempts to read both passages in the same key.[14]

As we said already, in 2 Cor. 5:8 and Phl. 1:23 Paul has himself in mind and not Christians in general, and he is thinking in both cases of quite a distinct situation in which he happens to find himself. In spite of this limited application the two passages are of extraordinary theologi-

---

12. op. cit. 42.
13. I would say that in 2 Cor. 5 it has completely receded in spite of the verdict of numerous commentators. But even E. Stauffer allows that in 2 Cor. 5 the hope has become "but a matter of prayer" (NT Theol., par. 53).
14. Menoud, 41, n. 3 and Lohmeyer, op. cit. ad hoc.

cal interest to us. I feel, it is at this point that we must set in, if we can no longer honestly accept the belief in the resurrection of the body in a literal sense and if, at the same time, we are not satisfied with a demythologised version of that belief which virtually amounts to an annihilation of the belief in a hereafter altogether. The hope which Paul expresses in Phl. 1:23, limited as it is in its application, is but the logical conclusion of a view of the Christian life which is quite fundamental to him. That is to say, the view that the Christian life is a union with Christ; a union which is sustained by the power of the Holy Spirit and which extends from the here to the hereafter. It is the view which has found its classical expression in Paul's interpretation of the rite of baptism in Rm. 6 and to which Albert Schweitzer has attached the not altogether satisfying label of "Christ Mysticism." The belief that those who have died with Christ will also live with him (R. 6:8) is one of the leading themes in Paul's letters. That theme recurs in a number of variations, but all alike reiterate, in their different ways, the quite fundamental conviction that the Christian life is geared to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, as it is expressed, for instance, in Phl. 3:10,11: "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible I may attain to the resurrection from the dead."

The phrase "syn Christoo einai" (To be with Christ) in Phl. 1:23 must be viewed in conjunction with the numerous phrases of a similar kind and the verbal compounds using the preposition "syn" which all express a conviction of which Phl. 1:23 is but the culmination. Once Phl. 1:23 is seen in this theological setting, it should also be clear that 2 Cor. 5:8 does, in fact, anticipate the hope expressed in Phl. 1:23. When Paul says, "We are of good courage, and we would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord," he is not consoling himself with what prospects an interim state is offering in case the parousia should not occur in his lifetime after all.[15] No, the situation is precisely the same as in Phl. 1:23, with the sole difference that the form of the afflictions which he carries for Christ's sake vary in each case. But in both cases they are sufficiently real to make him contemplate the possibility of death. The notoriously difficult passage 2 Cor. 5:1-10 will not yield its meaning as long as commentators fail to read it in the wider context of which

15. So Hering, CNT., VIII ad hoc.

"thlipsis" (affliction) in its manifold forms is the theme. If we wish to understand 2 Cor. 5:8, we must keep 4:10 in mind, "always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies."

If it is granted that 2 Cor. 5:8 too has the exceptional case of the martyr death in view,[16] then 5:1-3 will not refer to a possible parousia during Paul's lifetime, describing in but different words the process which Paul visualised in 1 Cor. 15:52, but to the hour of death. In that case, the remark that a body is ready for us in heaven explains how it is possible to be with the Lord once Paul has slipped out of this body. The other body is ready for him to slip into at the hour of death. In that way, the "nakedness" or ghost-like existence in the interim-state is avoided. It is not at all likely that Paul would have referred to that interim as a state of "nakedness" if he had thought it to be anything like what Cullmann and Menoud imagine it to be. Not only 1 Th. 4:17 contradicts this view, also his original expectation of the parousia in his own lifetime speaks against it rather than for it.

Assuming that we have done justice to the meaning of Phl. 1:23 and 2 Cor. 5:8, what is gained by the exegetical result for our attempt to state the biblical hope in the hereafter in such a manner that it can honestly be accepted by modern man? First, it removes the awkward notion of an interim state; secondly, it enables us to dispense with the idea of a "last day" in time as the date of resurrection; and thirdly, by removing the scene of resurrection from the here to the hereafter at the hour of death it allows us to leave behind the naive picture of the tombs yielding their dead, etc., on the last day. At the same time, by introducing the notion of a celestial body which is available immediately at the hour of death, Paul avoids the difficulties which any view of the immortality of the soul presents, so far as the survival of the individual is concerned. In fact, as long as one operates with the idea of immortality, one is logically forced to state the belief in the hereafter in terms of reabsorption, for the principle of individuation is not the soul but the body. There appears to be no getting away from this.[17] The fact that Paul considers these ideas only in connection with the death of a martyr should not prove an insurmountable barrier for applying them to the Christian hope generally. As we saw, these ideas are deeply rooted in one of the dominant themes of his thought con-

16. A. Schweitzer denies this, 135.
17. cp. A. J. Ayer, **The Problem of Knowledge**, 192.

cerning the Christian life and, therefore, suggest, in fact, universal application to all Christians alike. After all, even an apostle's thought is in a state of flux, and it should therefore be legitimate to pursue a line of thought which he himself has suggested but did not carry to its logical conclusion. Did not also, per contra, the Church abandon a line of thought, without compunction, when it considered it mistaken, as in the case of the Millenium?

There is then some gain in stating the Christian hope concerning the hereafter in terms of Phl. 1:23 and 2 Cor. 5:8, but it would be ingenuous to suggest that this version of the belief in resurrection should prove "acceptable" to modern man. All that can be said for it is that it will be more acceptable than the traditional version of it. Obstacles remain, and these cannot be removed, for they are bound up with the "skandalon" of the Christian message. A skandalon that attaches not only to the Cross and the Incarnation, but quite generally to the idea of a transcendent order of existence which is discontinuous with the world of experience and to which the analogies which we take from this world do not apply in an unbroken fashion. A. J. Ayer, after granting that the notion of survival is not self-contradictory or meaningless, points to the real difficulty when he adds, what is sometimes overlooked in the belief in physical resurrection "is that this would require the preservation of spatiotemporal continuity. Otherwise, it would not be the same body. On this view, the dissolution of the body destroys the person, no matter what subsequently happens."[18] In 2 Cor. 5:1, Paul boldly abandons the notion of an identical body when he introduces the idea of a celestial body that will replace the old body. In this way he is able to make sure that what continues is a person. But is it the same person? The idea of the celestial body "swallowing up" the mortal body (2 Cor. 5:4) is obviously meant to secure this identity, but for us it is only a picture which we cannot accept in a literal sense. In this context, the reference to the Spirit in v. 5 is significant. It makes it clear that the continuity is one of grace; consequently it comes into view only through the "leap" of faith.

Principally, we must leave it at that, but does this necessarily also confine us to the bare assertion that at the hour of death we shall be "with the Lord"? Is there nothing more to be said, at least in a tentative way, to give it colour

---

18. op. cit. 192, 193.

and meaning? In a recent issue of this journal,[19] Runia criticised Karl Barth's concept of "eternalisation" ("Verewigung"). I, too, find this idea unacceptable, for it appears to be but another version of reabsorption. On the other hand, I am not without sympathy with Karl Barth's attempt to make the belief in the hereafter real to himself and his readers. If it is to have a vital place in our life here we must attempt some kind of statement that transcends the biblical vocabulary. I am fully aware of the speculative element in what I am going to say in the following. If I were to copy the apostle Paul I would introduce these remarks with the words, "Lo! I tell you a mystery."[20] At the worst, I cannot be farther wrong than Paul in his expectation of the parousia in his own lifetime.[21] When I ask myself what possibly the life hereafter can mean for me personally, I find nothing so helpful as Sartre's analysis of the human situation.[22] Fastening on the observation that man is a "consciousness," he comes to the conclusion that in the human situation the law of identity does not apply. In this respect, the human being is radically different from the world of objects. I am not identical with my self in the same way in which a tree is a tree, or a cat is a cat. There runs a fissure right through my being which keeps me for ever at a distance from myself. It is the burden of consciousness (on the level of the cogito).[23] To use Sartre's existentialist jargon, "human reality is a perpetual surpassing toward a coincidence with itself which is never given."[24] In other words, throughout our whole life we are chasing after our self without ever getting hold of it. In Sartre's novels we sometimes meet characters who, in an existentialist failure of nerves, long to be like a tree or who try to wrest the sensation of identity from some object by touching it. I think this straining toward the sensation of identity is quite fundamental in man, but it is denied us here. Could it be that one purpose of the life hereafter were to take us to that experience of identity? I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not suggest that our experience of the fissure in us is, so to speak, a guarantee for completion in a hereafter. Nothing of the kind. Sartre himself draws

---

19. Febr. 1958, p. 7.
20. G. Bornkamm, **Th. Wb.** IV, 829, does not justice to this speculative element in Paul's use of "mysterion" in 1. Cor. 15.51 and Rm. 11.25.
21. vid. Lietzmann, Hdb ad hoc for the embarrassment about Paul's mistake as reflected in the history of the text.
22. **L'etre et le neant** (1943), deuxieme partie, c. I (Engl. Tr. **Being and Nothingness**, pp. 73ss).
23. Engl. Tr., pp. 74, 77, 78.
24. Engl. Tr., p. 89.

a very different conclusion when he declares, "Human reality therefore is by nature an unhappy consciousness with no possibility of surpassing its unhappy state."[25] And we must allow him that there is nothing illogical in his conclusion.

Our assertions concerning identity cannot but rest on faith. As a matter of fact, I would not have introduced my ideas on the subject, if I had thought them to be merely a matter of speculation, without any biblical ground to support them. In I Cor. 8:3,[26] Paul says, "If one loves God, one is known by him." One meaning of this sentence is obviously that love includes us among the elect of God, but the word "known" must also be taken in its primary sense. So understood, it means that God knows us and in knowing us establishes our identity. That thought in itself might be anything but comforting. As we contemplate the judgment we might feel more like the criminal who dreads the moment when his identity will be established. As it is, Paul things, of course, of the divine grace and love when he speaks of God as knowing us. And I believe, an argument from analogy will be here not entirely out of place. Most of us, I should say, will not be entirely ignorant of occasions when we felt "at our best" or, as we say, were "ourselves," because we experienced a knowledge of us inspired by love. Now, if even human love can bring our true self at least momentarily into sight, how much more God whose love is absolute and without error of judgment.

Again, in I Jo. 3:2, we read, "Beloved, we are God's children now; it does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." These words, to my mind, state the Christian hope concerning the individual in an unsurpassed manner. Taken in conjunction with I Cor. 8:3 we can interpret them in the following way. God knows us now, and our identity is established in his knowledge of us; on the other side of death we too shall come to know our own identity, for when we shall know him as he is we shall also know ourselves as we are, that is, as we are by the grace of God, redeemed in his love.

Such hope rests, of course, entirely on faith. There is no device by which it can be rendered "acceptable" to modern man other than by encouraging him to make the "leap" himself. Legitimate as it is to remove unnecessary obstacles, such as the literal interpretation of what is

25. Engl. Tr., p. 90.
26. cp. also Gl.4.9.

obviously mythological imagery, the skandalon itself cannot be removed. Without faith, the only identity that is open to man is that of the corpse; without faith, a God of whom consciousness and identity are predicated is but a figment of the mind. On his own ground, Sartre is quite justified in protesting, "Let no one reproach us with capriciously inventing a being of this kind. . . . Is not God a being who is what he is — in that he is all positivity and the foundation of the world — and at the same time a being who is not what he is and who is what he is not — in that he is self-conciousness and the necessary foundation of himself?"[27] And yet, this is precisely what we affirm of God and of our own life in the hereafter. A startling affirmation, to be sure. But is it also "absurd," in the sense that it defies reason altogether? If by way of association my use of the term "leap" should have suggested Kierkegaard's notion of "absurdity," then it was entirely unintentional on my part. To my mind, the notion of discontinuity is not in itself contradictory. That does not dispense with the "leap"; on the other hand, it does not render the Christian hope in the hereafter unreasonable from the start.

In the above, I have deliberately confined myself to a discussion of the hope in the hereafter so far as it affects the individual. With that, I do not wish, however, to give the impression that it must be confined to the individual. I am fully aware, "the Christian Church's teaching, both Roman and Protestant, has been that there can be no complete consummation for the individual until there is consummation also for society."[28] If I am permitted to replace the word "until" by "unless," these words of John Baillie can pass as my own. As it is, the limit of space has compelled me to be selective even in my discussion of the individual hope in the hereafter. Such questions as the relation of time and eternity; eternal punishment, annihilation, or universalism; rest or activity; and others, which have all a bearing on our subject, have not as much as been mentioned. This is unavoidable under the circumstances. All that I can hope is that the reader will not altogether disapprove of my selection of the material.

H. H. REX.

---

27. Engl. Tr., p. 90.
28. J. Baillie, op. cit. 249.

Book Reviews

HAMANN-STUDIEN.

By Fritz Blanke (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich), 1956, pp. 127, Sw. fr. 16.60.

The present volume is a collection of essays which were originally published in different journals. Both the renewed interest in Hamann and the intrinsic merit of Blanke's studies make this re-publication very welcome indeed.

J. G. Hamann (1730-1788) was a contemporary of Kant, and like him, he belongs to the city of Königsberg. They knew each other, but Hamann was in disagreement with Kant's point-of-view. In fact, he was one of the most determined critics of the Age of Enlightenment. He made David Hume's famous words concerning the Christian Religion his own and turned them against his rationalist contemporaries: It cannot be believed by any reasonable person without a miracle; mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity.

F. K. von Moser called him the "Magus in the North," and he has been known by that name ever since. The name does not refer, as frequently thought, to the oracular and obscure nature of his language, but it describes him as the man who, like the wise men of old, saw the star of Bethlehem in an age that knew not the Christ.

Hamann had undergone an experience of conversion while on a visit in London (1785), and in the following year he came across the collected works of Luther in his father's library. The remarkable thing is that he got hold of the very heart of Luther's theology of the cross in an age that paid but lip service to the reformer. With the exception of Lessing, Hamann had no equal in his knowledge of Luther in the eighteenth century.

One of Blanke's essays deals with Hamann's views of the nature of language. Not that we shall be able to make his views of language our own, but there is much in them to stimulate the thought of a generation of theologians engrossed in the problem of interpretation, not least of all the notion of the Word of God as an Incarnation.

Hamann died in Münster in Westphalia on a visit to the Roman Catholic Princess von Gallitzin (1748-1806) who cherished him as a spiritual adviser. His body was taken by Fürstenberg, the Vicar General of the diocese, and Overberg, the princess's future chaplain, to her residence and buried in her garden. A singular tribute to the preacher of Luther's theologia crucis.

We are greatly indebted to Professor Blanke for his beautiful and illuminating introduction to this singular man and we owe thanks to the publishers for making the badly missed essays available to us again.

H. H. REX.

FOR FAITH AND FREEDOM.

Vol. II, Christian Theology. Gifford Lectures in the University of Glasgow. By Leonard Hodgson (Blackwell, Oxford), 1957, pp. 237; 41/6 (Aust.).

In the first series of lectures, published in 1956, Prof. Hodgson began by repudiating Lord Gifford's sharp distinction between natural and revealed theology, but thereafter confined his argument to the evidence of the former. The general conclusion was that the Creator's purpose was to make in His world a community of finite and free persons. In this second series he discusses how much further we can go if the data of Christian revelation are taken into account.

The first six lectures attempt this in relation to the Bible, God, the problem of evil, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Church, respectively. The last four discuss Grace, Prayer and Providence, Eschatology, and finally as a summary the whole question of Freedom and Faith. There

is an acutely argued appendix in rebuttal of criticisms which have been directed against his Croall Lectures on the Doctrine of the Trinity, published in 1943.

The lectures exhibit in a very marked form a characteristic which has been noticeable, increasingly I think, in Prof. Hodgson's books, that they are sections of his own intellectual autobiography. This seemed a great advantage in the book on the doctrine of the Trinity: it was refreshing to read a completely candid account of the author's own thinking. In the Gifford Lectures the advantage is less unequivocal, since the subjects dealt with are far more general.

Where a subject has been long dominant in an author's mind, or where he has something really characteristic to say, we are grateful for his method. For instance, Prof. Hodgson is at his best when he is dealing with the classical Christological and Trinitarian questions treated of by the great Councils of the fourth and following centuries. Again, he has really good things to say about, for instance, our Lord's temptations, and about the resurrection of the body. He sometimes scores a good point against theologians much junior to himself, as on p. 58 "I have noticed . . . in some reformed theologians a curious combination of the statement that we know nothing of God except through the revelation in Christ with an acceptance as a fundamental principle of an idea of the sovereignty of God which is not derived from that revelation but is an *a priori* notion, taken for granted and unquestioned." Here, as often, it is an advantage to him that he can take a cross-bench view.

But it must be admitted that the method shows its drawbacks in many ways. The opening lecture, on the Bible, says some quite unacceptable things, such as that, in the Old Testament, God was thought of as unipersonal; there is no sign of awareness that this statement made without qualification would be rejected by most biblical students today. There is indeed a general crudity about the use of distinctively biblical categories.

The author has indeed read widely in theology by writers who are his juniors, and he quotes many of them appreciatively. But his main source of quotation is his own earlier books; he evidently does this because they are earlier sections of his autobiography of which the later are a direct continuation. But the habit does not contribute to the reader's interest in these lectures. Your reviewer must confess to having constantly felt sorry that so candid and consistent an argument could be, on the whole, so dull to read. Too much of it gave the impression that a writer of a past generation was making a courageous but only partly successful effort to lecture his misguided successors.

It may be that many others will find the argument more interesting; at any rate we shall all agree that it is utterly genuine, and records processes of a single and well stocked mind.

ANTONY SNELL, S.S.M.

A THEOLOGY OF ELECTION.

By Jacob Jocz (S.P.C.K., London), 1958, pp. 227; 25/-.

Judaism and Christianity possess the Old Testament in common. Thus both Judaism and Christianity claim to be the true Israel that stems from the Old Testament People of God. So it is understandable how there should be constant debate between the two faiths. Nowadays that debate is both courteous and highly theological. Few people are better qualified than Dr. Jocz to further the argument to its next phase in the light of the multifarious biblical and theological studies of the present day. And he has a worthwhile contribution to make. For example, in regard to Romans 9-11 he is constructive; yet he can give good answer to such as the well-known German New Testament

theologian, Prof. W. Zimmerli. He contends that Paul speaks of election in a two-fold manner, sometimes in personal terms and sometimes in collective. The two, he says, are not the same. Israel's election is in respect of revelation; individual election is in respect of salvation. But is this always so? we may well ask Jocz. Is election, whether collective or individual, not to service, primarily, and only through service to salvation? Jocz shows the clear continuity of revelation from the Old Covenant to the New, and argues well to show that the latter is not a different covenant, but the original covenant established once and for all. So he is able to give a good interpretation of "not one jot or title shall pass away," and to show that the Messiah's task is not to abolish the Law or to substitute another Law (not even the Sermon on the Mount) but to recover the Law's original intention. The expression *he palaia diatheke* occurs only once in the whole New Testament (II Cor. 3.14), and there it does not mean "old" as distinct from "new," but means "ancient," and so is just another name for the Torah. In the same way we have no right to speak of a "new" Israel, and there is no such expression in the whole Bible. There can be no plural to Israel. Such is the basis of Paul's argument. Neither for Jesus nor Paul was Israel a purely physical concept. Israel is only Israel by reason of revelation and not by reason of physical descent from Abraham. The distinctive mark of Israel's election is not "race" but Promise.

This is a rich study, full of reward for him who reads it closely. But it is an unnecessarily difficult work. Jocz quotes Latin, Greek, Hebrew and German without translating. His argument seldom proceeds in a straight line. It is as if he were saying: "That reminds me . . . " and he goes off at a tangent down what may, indeed, be an interesting side-road. Should "Forth" Bridge not be "Tay" Bridge (p. 153)? Yet Dr. Jocz's wide reading and well-documented study will prove a landmark in Jewish-Christian relations, anl the final chapter on the right of the Hebrew-Christian to his faith will give new heart to the many Christ-believing Jews of our time.

G. A. F. KNIGHT.*

*Whilst occupying the Chair of Old Testament Studies at Knox College, University of Otago, 1947-58, Professor Knight has contributed many valued articles and reviews to this publication. We add our congratulations on his recent appointment to the newly created Lectureship in Old Testament and Hebrew in St. Mary's and St. Salvator's Colleges, University of St. Andrews, Scotland.

CHRISTIAN OBEDIENCE IN THE UNIVERSITY.

Studies in the life of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland, 1930-1950. By J. Davis McCaughey, Professor of Biblical Studies, Ormond College, Melbourne (S.C.M. Press, London), 1958, pp. 228; 25/-.

This is a book about what it means to be a Christian in the modern world, in which a vital and formative role is played by the University, which the Student Movement exists to serve. It is full of spiritual wisdom, always briefly and concisely expressed. It covers the period 1930-1950, that is, from the time when the Liberal theological outlook was going out down to our own day; it has therefore to deal with many vital themes. Repeatedly the point comes up, What does it mean to be a Christian? and the answer, given by many voices in turn, is that it means not to accept a personal salvation while letting the world go by, but to be obedient to God with the whole of one's life, and accept all the responsibilities involved in the situation in which one is; not merely to confess our Lord as one's personal Saviour, but to believe in Him, crucified, risen and ascended, as the actual reigning King and Judge of His world. Reinhold Niebuhr is quoted as saying, "When these students come up against a difficulty, they just quit grappling and take an elevator to the eternal." But it is not that this

represents the typical student attitude; for as this book shows, the call has been heard. This is, then, a book about Evangelism in its true sense, as the evangelisation of life in its length and breadth and depth.

First, there is the pre-war period. Why did the League of Nations fail in Manchuria in 1931? Why were we in the West slow to see the totalitarian menace of Fascism? What are the lessons of the German Church Conflict against Nazism? How do we face up to Communism? Do we see it as holding up a mirror to the Church as "the guilty party which has betrayed its truth?" Second, there is the war-period, when many Christians had to learn what it meant to be a Christian in the crowded space of some small cruiser, with no opportunity for leisure or prayer, or like Dietrich Bonhoeffer in a concentration camp, or in occupied France? Third, there is the post-war period, with the urgent question, What is a University for? Is it a place where academic subjects are studied, or where men and women train for a career, without regard to the relevance of those studies to the life that they are living now and will have to live in the years that follow? Here again, it is all wrong to confine Evangelism to personal religion, as when for instance a Christian who is a psychiatrist leaves his religion and his professional duties in separate compartments of his life.

The book leaves one full of admiration and gratitude for the zeal and the energy and the outstanding ability with which the S.C.M. has been tackling its most vital task. For it has stood at a key-point for the answer to the question whether the so-called "free-world" can stand up to the fierce challenge of the forces which are questioning its right to exist.

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

JESUS AND HIS COMING.

By J. A. T. Robinson (S.C.M. Press, London), 1957, pp. 192; 15/-.

Dr. J. A. T. Robinson digs with all the loving care and respect for material of a good archaeologist; and like any good archaeologist he is particular not to destroy the evidence, but to leave it uncovered for others to examine for themselves and draw their own conclusions. His book has as a sub-title "the emergence of a doctrine." The result of his enquiry is a beautifully cleared site, on which we can see for ourselves the various strata in the developing tradition of the Church of the New Testament period concerning the return of Christ. The problem is simply stated: the New Testament writers seem almost (but not quite) unanimous in their belief that at the last day Christ will return to the earth in a manner similar to that in which He departed. Where did this belief come from? The simplest answer would be: from Jesus Himself. But, Dr. Robinson demonstrates, the authentic words of Jesus teach no such thing. Jesus teaches a last and final act in which God vindicates His Glory; but he does not associate with it what we have come to call "the Second Coming" (an un-Biblical phrase), or what the New Testament refers to as the parousia. "We must speak not of a realised, but of an inaugurated eschatology, of the Son of Man 'coming to his own' in all the power of God, till the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of God and of his Christ. For Jesus the messianic act would certainly not be exhausted in his death and resurrection. On the contrary, this moment would but release and initiate that reign of God in which *henceforth* the Father's redeeming work could be brought to the fulfilment which hitherto it was denied. But what fails is the evidence that Jesus thought of the messianic act as taking place in two stages, the first of which was now shortly to be accomplished, the second of which would follow after an interval and must in the meantime be the focus of every eye and thought."

From where then did it come? How did it arise? And is it (although not found in the teaching of Jesus) still a necessary article of the Church's faith? Dr. Robinson is not a man disposed to run away from these or any other relevant questions. Having made, like several recent scholars, the attempt to return to Jesus from the primitive Church, he then traces the reverse process — the movement from the expectation of Jesus to that of the Church. He describes the emergence of the parousia doctrine, and the reasons for it; and is not afraid to speak of how this doctrine may be held today. Even if space permitted, to hint at the answers to his questions would be unfair to the author and his readers. Archaeologists, writers of detective stories and good Biblical critics have this in common: they are entitled to ask reviewers not to rob readers of pleasures in store. It is enough to say (for those who need reassurance) that Dr. Robinson's care and controlled imagination as an exegete never fails to stimulate and inform; and he has the advantage of some of his fellows in possessing a felicitous style, and in knowing that philosophical and dogmatic presuppositions underlie the questions we ask of Scripture, just as they should be controlled by what we find there. Finally, if Dr. Robinson is right, our preaching, praying and thinking should be affected by his conclusions. If he is wrong, someone should tell him so.

J. D. McCAUGHEY.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS.

By E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1958, pp. 328, $4.00.

This, the seventh volume in the I.C.N.T., combines two commentaries of markedly different character both, as it happens, by laymen with a classical background. Mr. Simpson, who "has lived the life of a private gentleman," gives us a rhetorical homily which reflects his protracted studies in Hellenistic language and in Puritan theology. Professor Bruce gives a precise and incisive piece of critical scholarship in the best modern manner. Since the themes of Ephesians and Colossians overlap to some extent, this difference in treatment is less of a defect than it might otherwise be. Indeed, if Bruce is right in his view that "Paul, having completed his letter to Colossae, allowed his thoughts to run on along the same line until he was gripped by the vision which finds expression in the companion letter, and began to dictate its contents in an exalted mood of inspired meditation, thanksgiving and prayer" (p. 172), the variety of method may even be felicitous — so long as Colossians is read first.

Mr. Simpson's special ability has already been seen in his commentary on the Pastorals (Tyndale Press, 1954). In Ephesians his chief aim seems to be to translate Paul's thought into a Reformed theological idiom. But not narrowly. Mr. Simpson catches the breadth of Paul's conception in a way quite unique among modern commentators. If the commentary does not exactly fulfil the aim of the series to be "an exposition that is thorough and abreast of modern scholarship," it is nevertheless a considerable work of theological insight. The linguistic comments in footnotes are learned and valuable (e.g., on *anakephalaiousthai,* p. 33). The diction is rich and exotic, frequently moving, but occasionally pompous. The chief defect is the neglect to analyse certain important terms beyond a rhetorical paraphrase (e.g., "the fulness of times" at 1:10, or "the heavenly places") and he misses many Old Testament allusions (e.g., on 6:1-4 and on 6:19). Many points of current discussions are ignored. There are only five pages of

Introduction and the writer is impatient of critical questions. "Only violent prejudice can question" that Ephesians and Colossians are not from the same author.

Professor Bruce's commentary on Colossians leaves little to be desired for thoroughness, clarity and theological appositeness. His inoffensive omniscience in his field takes in journals as well as books and sucks no small advantage from a variety of writers. One appreciates, for instance, account being taken of an article like Henry Chadwick's "All Things to All Men" in a recent "New Testament Studies." Bruce's own handling of crucial points is a model of exactness and good judgement, as on *pleroma* (p. 206), reconciliation (p. 208 ff.) or circumcision (p. 234). The reviewer could find no significant point of exposition that Bruce overlooks, and we are fortunate to be so well served now for Colossians, especially if we add Professor C. F. Moule's smaller Cambridge commentary which appeared last year but too late for Bruce to take it into account.

In the course of the 10-page Introduction, Professor Bruce makes this comment: "It is regrettable that in many Protestant quarters Paulinism has been equated so absolutely with the emphasis of Galatians and Romans that the corporate and cosmic insights of Colossians and Ephesians have been felt to be non-Pauline. There is room in true Paulinism for both, and contemporary evangelicalism must similarly make room for both if it is not to become lop-sided and defective."

D. W. B. ROBINSON.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

By Vincent Taylor (Macmillan, London), 1958, pp. 321; 34/9 (Aust.).

Introduced by that elucidating volume, *The Names of Jesus*, the Speaker's Lectures, delivered at Oxford, 1951-6, in their published form, conclude with this their third and final part. The volume is divided into two almost equal sections, the first containing an exegetical examination of the various N.T. writings and the second a consideration of the historical and theological implications of the conclusions thus reached.

Christological thinking builds upon the historical foundation of the Synoptic tradition where the developing consciousness of Sonship evidences a divine person within the limitations of a human life. The Synoptics, in which Sonship is visible only in the highest contours, reveal the form of the manifestation, whereas the interpretative Fourth Gospel, in which the Sonship is displayed on an even plain, indicates its quality. "In the Synoptics the Sonship of Jesus, with permanent consequences, stands out like the tall crests of a relief map, and . . . in the Fourth Gospel it appears continuously like high points studded upon a high plateau" (183). The categories of Lordship and Sonship are prominent in the N.T. interpretation of Christ. The former, applied to Jesus as a consequence of the Resurrection "voices the passionate worship of the gathered communities of believers both early and late. It comes from the conventicle and the altar rather than the school and it was destined to live on through later centuries" (137). Thus focused, "the brown earth of common Christian belief" (37), the persistent primitive tradition, which assuming Christ to be divine was much richer in its implications than its statements, constituted "the matrix out of which a greater faith was born" (194). The great N.T. writings, the Pauline, Johannine and the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the teaching of which the terminology of Sonship is given prominence, endeavoured to transcend the limitations of primitive Christianity by closely connecting the person and work of Christ and the consequences

of both upon the doctrine of God in the conceptions of Logos, Wisdom and Divine Redeemer. Whilst these writings did not completely succeed in theologically relating a strong monotheistic faith and the divine epithets applied to Christ, as indicated by the intractable element of subordinationism, they nevertheless by making room for the conception of distinction within the Godhead (in their utterances concerning both the Son and Spirit) foreshadowed developments which subsequently issued in the rich formulation of Nicaea. Hence, if the edifice of the docrtine of the Trinity is of later origin, the *disjecta membra,* the stones for the building are found in the N.T. The criticism, however, will be raised that Dr. Taylor in his interpretation of the N.T. writers over-emphasises the element of subordination (which is economic rather than essential) as manifested by his questionable tendency to exclude from them any specific reference to Christ as God. Thus in John 1:1 he translates *"Theos"* by "divine" (109) on the apparent ground that it occurs without the article, whereas its absence is explained by the predicative nature of the proper name. If an adjective had been required *theios* would naturally have been used.

In the concluding chapters Dr. Taylor considers the relationship of the N.T. teaching on the person of Christ to the history of the doctrine and its philosophic and religious implications. In considering the conception of the Trinity, as the necessary context of Christology, he rejects Barth's nomenclature of "modes of being" and cogently advocates the view of the Anglican school represented by L. Hodgson that the three Persons are persons in the full modern sense of the term since in the N.T. they are beings between whom relationships of fellowship and love are possible. Here he is on firm ground, but his conclusions do not necessarily follow from the N.T. premises when he appears as a rather belated champion of the kenotic theory, virtually expounding as his text the words of H. R. Mackintosh in *The Person of Jesus Christ* referring to the incarnate Son "as now possessing *all* the qualities of Godhead in the form of concentrated potency rather than of full actuality, *dunamei* rather than *energeia* (264). In this connection his reply to the trenchant objections of W. Temple and D. M. Baillie are unimpressive, and further, he appears oblivious of the even more incisive criticism voiced by Warfield (e.g. "God to be God must be all He can be actually . . . When He ceases to be actually what God is, He ceases of course to be God"—*Critical Reviews,* 317) and Barth (e.g. "Of what value would His deity be to us if—instead of crossing in that deity the very gulf between Him and us—He left that deity behind in coming to us? . . . What would be the value to us of His way into the far country if in the course of it He lost Himself? *Church Dogmatics,* IV/1/185).

However, although Dr. Taylor exposures himself to serious stricture when away from his home territory in the field of systematic theology, the analysis and synthesis of the N.T. evidence in this important and valuable book is presented with his customary thoroughness and lucidity. Further, as with his other writings, this volume is marked by a characteristic attitude of reverence and committal, for "Jesus will always remain a challenge to be met rather than a problem to be solved" (166).

R. SWANTON.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Plato and the Christians, by Adam Fox (S.C.M., 21/-). Since the days of the early Alexandrian Fathers the relationship of the Church and the Academy has aroused perennial interest. Archdeacon Fox of Westminster here has rendered a useful service in selecting and translating passags bearing on theology and morality from Plato, giving

them appropriate titles and relating them to specific Biblical texts. The admission that "occasionally these texts are apposite, sometimes rather far-fetched" (12) indicates clearly the recognition of difference as well as similarity. However, in contrast to that contemporary theology which like Tertullian would set a radical antithesis between Jerusalem and Athens, the writer's main conclusion is that Greek logic, as embodied in Plato (and developed in his pupil, Aristotle) constitutes an abiding contribution to the Palestine-bred Christian religion.

Essays in Liberality, by Alec R. Vidler (S.C.M., 15/-). In this varied collection of ten essays ranging from "History according to the Bible" to "The Appalling Religiousness of America" the author's viewpoint is that of a liberal Catholic as contrasted with that of a rationalist Liberal on the one hand and of an intransigeant Catholic on the other. Of Bishop Gore he writes: "Although he had liberal ideas and was capable of appreciating liberal virtues, he was not temperamentally or characteristically liberal or liberal minded" (148). This stimulating collection of essays are largely expressive of that ideal of the liberal temper, of that open-mindedness after which the writer aspires.

The Wisdom of the Fathers, by Erik Routley (S.C.M., 8/6). The writer here presents eight separate studies ranging from "Origen On Reading the Bible" to "John of Damascus on Visual Aids." In a stimulating treatment the Church is shown as "wrestling at a very early stage with questions that have concerned it in every generation since, and which are still concerning it now" (9).

The Letter and the Spirit, by R. M. Grant (S.P.C.K., London, 15/-). The aim of this book is to trace a direct line of continuity from Greek allegorical method through Jewish-Hellenistic exegesis to the climax of allegorization with the Christian Alexandrians of the third century. The exegesis of Origen, it is concluded is "fundamentally spiritual and unhistorical. He is the heir of the Greek allegorizer, of Plato, and of the gnostics" (96). Among others, a valuable and lengthy appendix on "Greek Exegetical Terminology" is added to this useful and interesting volume.

Remember Jesus Christ, by Charles R. Erdman (Eerdmans, $2.00). This small book contains a series of Lenten meditations covering the significant incidents and words in Christ's last journey and its culmination at Jerusalem. Characterised by marked spiritual insight it will rank high in literature of this category. A distinctive feature of the volume is that each of the twelve chapters is headed by the representation of an ancient Christian symbol.

The Meaning of Persons, by Paul Tournier (S.C.M., London, 21/-). The author, Genevese physician and psychologist, here seeks behind the automatic routine of the external camouflaged "personage" the original creation of the authentic inward "person" which has been increasingly eclipsed by the mechanization of life. This quest can only be followed along "the road of personal dialogue with God and with my fellows" (88). Hence in the face of the dominant technical nature of modern medicine Tournier strongly advocates the necessity in his profession of a medicine of the person with its aim "to allow the person to reappear through a rending apart of the personage" (219). This suggestive book, written out of a long and wide practical experience, forms a worthy companion to the writer's earlier volume, *A Doctor's Casebook in the Light of the Bible.*

The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, by George S. Hendry (S.C.M., 12/6). Following the ecclesiastical rather than the canonical order, this small book deals successively with the relationship of the Holy Spirit to Christ, God, Church, Word and the Human Spirit.

The Christological approach determines the doctrinal form as based on a dialectical pattern of identity and distinction between the Spirit and Christ. The writer endeavours to mediate between the Protestant conception of the Spirit in the Word as *over* the Church and the Catholic conception of the Word as *under* the Spirit in the Church by emphasising the efficacy of the Word through the Spirit as being only *in* the context of the Church. "Luther said that the Word is the cradle in which Christ lies; we may also say that the Church is the nursery in which the cradle lies" (91). This conception of the enveloping Church may be interpreted as infringing on the *sola scriptura* principle, especially as elsewhere the reference to the Church as "prefixing the Old Testament to the New in the canon of Christian Scripture" (15) implies that the Apostolic Church had no Scripture, whereas, as Barth correctly declares, the addition was the New and not the Old Testament which from the beginning was the self-evident constituted basis of Holy Scripture for the Christian Church. The volume, however, is one of very considerable value as the difficulties and obscurities of the subject are throughout related to recent thought and the author, who is Charles Hodge Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton, reveals in his observations both acute criticism and deep insight.

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, by H. H. Rowley (S.P.C.K., 2/-). This small booklet examines the claim of various sensational writers that New Testament Christianity is derived from the sect of the Qumran texts. The alleged common basic conceptions on analysis are clearly shown to possess only a superficial similarity and the writer convincingly concludes that "there is no evidence to connect Jesus or the New Testament directly with the sect" (32).

R. Swanton.

Subjectivity and Paradox, by J. Heywood Thomas (Basil Blackwell, 18/6). This volume belongs to the rapidly expounding corpus of Kierkegaardian literature. It is an attempt to illustrate Kierkegaard's contribution to the philosophy of religion by a discussion of the two themes: subjectivity and paradox. One of the most valuable features of this admirable study is the thoroughness with which the author explores the influences—particularly the philosophical influences—which moulded Kierkegaard's development, either by attraction or repulsion. This has not been done with a like thoroughness before; and, needless to say, it both clarifies and illumines Kierkegaard's own original contribution. Again, the author's exposition of some of the more tortuous passages in Kierkegaard is most helpful. There is little to criticise and much to commend in this able and competent study.

S. Barton Babbage.

The Pastoral Epistles, An Introduction and Commentary, by Donald Guthrie (Tyndale, 9/6). This is a very careful commentary (cheaply and well produced). The Pastorals present special problems, but in both introduction and exegesis Guthrie shows caution and common sense. Perhaps the time is not ripe for a confident, full-scale commentary on the Pastorals, and if Guthrie is inevitably defensive, he makes up by the comprehensiveness of his survey. The crux is that, if the Pastorals are not Pauline, they are not Scripture. If they lack apostolic authority, they lack any claim to our obedience as the Word of God. These possibilities do not prove the epistles Pauline, but the Christian scholar must have some conviction, before he can satisfactorily set about his task, as to whether he is engaged in Biblical

studies or in Patristics. Guthrie defends Paul's authorship very fairly in 67 pages, summarising the conclusions of his Tyndale monograph (1955) in which he analysed P. N. Harrison's linguistic theory. Guthrie's case is impressive, and he rightly recalls Dibelius' remark "that the statistical method for determining authenticity has been largely discounted." It is surprising, nevertheless, that the author dismisses in a line the possibility of "greater freedom allowed to the amenuensis." While the question of amenuenses remains virtually unexplored, there will remain a serious gap in our theories about authorship. The commentary itself is judicious, if seldom original, and makes discriminating use of other men's labours. It is especially useful to have some glimpse of Spicq's work (1948) and Jeremias (1953), both of whom uphold the Pauline authorship.

D. W. B. Robinson.

Roman Catholicism in England, by E. I. Watkin (Oxford, 11/3 Aust.). This addition to the Home University Library traces the course of the Roman Catholic religion "as it has existed and acted in England since the Reformation." Written from the Roman Catholic viewpoint, the author, influenced by the eirenical theology of Louis Bouyer, seeks objectivity, for, whilst naturally regarding the story as one of faith and heroism, he yet does not "pass over or minimise the all too human aspect of the Church, the inevitable limitations, defects, abuses, conflicts." Not the least interesting aspect of this informative book is its account of the continuing internal struggle between Gallicanism and Ultramontism on the English scene.

Biblical Foundations, by B. B. Warfield (Tyndale, 15/6). This selection of studies is reproduced from three volumes in the recent American edition of Warfield (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia) which were earlier reviewed in this Journal. Appropriately named, the collection includes: "The Biblical Idea of Revelation"; "The Biblical Idea of Inspiration"; "The Biblical Doctrine of the Trinity"; "The Supernatural Birth of Christ"; "The Person of Christ according to the New Testament"; "Christ, our Sacrifice"; "The New Testament Terminology of Redemption"; "Predestination"; "Faith." Throughout these studies, Warfield's exegetical gifts, logical precision and pellucid style are strikingly evident. This book will render a valuable service in making the work of this American giant of orthodoxy in the heyday of liberalism better known to British (including Australasian) readers to whom for too long it has remained *terra incognita.* "The selection of subjects in this volume is most judicious and representative," concludes Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones in his appreciative foreword, "and should serve as a perfect introduction to the works of the greatest exponent, expounder and defender of the classic Reformed faith in the 20th century." (p. 10).

Between God and Satan, by Helmut Thielicke, translated by C. C. Barber (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 10/6). Originating under Nazi tyranny, this small book, based on the three temptations of Christ, develops the theme that "the abyss of temptation yawns not before but within us; therefore we cannot be true to God, but God must be true to us." (p. 42). Spiritual insight finds vivid expression thus; "In the practical affairs of our life worry is precisely what idolatry is in the religious sphere . . . When we drive God out of the door, ghosts come in at the window — the ghosts of worry and of other gods" (p. 40).

That My House May be Filled, by Harry R. Boer (Eerdmans, $1.50). Whilst specifically related to the study of evangelism in the Christian Reformed Church in its American environment, this small book as dealing with basic Christian conceptions will be of wider interest. The

great commission of Christ standing at the beginning of the new creation, comparable to the command to multiply at the beginning of the old creation, expressing a law constitutive of the being and life of the Church, was put into effect by the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost and becoming thus a living reality in the lives of men, no further reference to it was necessary in the New Testament. Hence, it is a mark of spiritual degeneration when subsequently the immanent law becomes a "command" so that it is necessary to plead with the Church to fulfil its missionary duty. Further, "the map for our travel in the land of evangelisation is the great commission as exemplified in Acts. The Lord has given us orders to travel *via a specific route*. That route is *disciple, baptise, teach*" (p. 64). When the post-baptismal development of an intellectual apprenhension is added to the commitment of faith as a condition of Church membership, this normative method of evangelism is inverted with serious consequences. Dr. Boer here presents in the specific context of his own conservative denomination of Dutch origin a valuable critical application of the principles earlier exponded in greater detail in his doctoral thesis at the Free University of Amsterdam, *Pentecost and the Missionary Witness of the Church*.

Sacramental Teaching and Practice in the Reformation Churches, by G. W. Bromiley (Eerdmans, $1.50). Seeking to elucidate the faith and practice of the Reformed rather than the Lutheran Churches, this recent addition to the Pathway Books expounds as the primary fact that "the real sacrament is the meaningful action of God in Jesus Christ — the true baptism and the true cup" (p. 16). Emphasising the presence of Christ as being mediated by the Spirit, it is acutely commented: "It is the error of transubstantiation on the one side to by-pass the work of the Holy Spirit, i.e., to try to have Christ without the Spirit, and of the Anabaptists on the other to rationalise or "spiritualise" it, i.e., to try to have the Spirit without Christ" (p. 92). Dr. Bromiley writes with the Anglican Reformation (on which he is an acknowledged authority) primarily in mind and it is only this, in addition to the fact that his discussion is designedly Biblical rather than historical, that makes it possible for him to write a concise and lucid account of the Reformed sacramental position without a single reference to Calvin.

Testament of Vision, by Henry Zylstra (Eerdmans, $3.50). This volume contains a selection of essays, contributed to various journals, relating to current literature, education and religion, concluding with a small number of personal letters written during war service in Eastern Asia. These miscellaneous writings possess, however, a unity in that they have a common concern, in view of contemporary disintegration, with the necessity of bringing the whole range of human life under the sway of Christian principle and purpose. "The whole Gospel for the whole man, and through him, for the whole society" (p. 183). The author, late Professor of English Literature at Calvin College, Michigan, characteristically makes the antithesis: "Christianity versus culture: no, it is the fundamentalist heresy. Culture alone: indeed not; it is the liberal heresy. Christianity through culture: the religious in man governing, shaping, determining the scientific, artistic, social in him, precisely; it is the Reformed truth" (p. 147). Written from the viewpoint of the Calvinist criterion theologically defined, and expressed in sensitive English, these essays in their reflections embody much penetrating observation and incisive comment, as, for instance, in the discussion on the relative value of general education and vocational training.

The Story of the Church, by A. M. Renwick, and *Basic Christianity*, by John W. R. Stott (I.V.F., London, 4/6 and 3/6). The first of these small books, by the Professor of Church History at the Free Church

College, Edinburgh, provides a useful and concise account of the history of the Christian community and its relationship to the rest of the world. The second, by the Vicar of All Souls, Langham Place, London, presents a clear and cogent apology for the Christian faith and life to the thoughtful enquirer. Mr. Stott adds to his ability as an expositor the mastery of a terse and challenging style, e.g., when he asks: "Was Socrates braver than Jesus? or were their cups filled with different poison?" The series, of which these are among the initial publications, promises to make a valuable contribution of a semi-popular nature towards the contemporary elucidation of the conservative Evangelical position.

To Build and Plant, by Herbert W. Abba (Independent, London, 7/6). This little memoir gives an interesting account of the author's ministry extending over almost the first half of this century in an industrial area in Yorkshire. An epilogue is appended by the author's son, Professor Raymond Abba, formerly Principal of Camden College, Sydney.

The Second Book of Discipline (Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church of Australia, Melbourne, 3/-). This basic Presbyterian document, long out of print, is here republished from the text in modernised English in *The Subordinate Standards and Formularies of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria* (1893). There is a short Introduction by F. Maxwell Bradshaw.

R. SWANTON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither precludes nor implies subsequent comment).

Basil Blackwell, Oxford: *Composition of the Book of Judges,* C. A. Simpson 62/- (Aust.).

Cambridge University Press, London: *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria,* E. F. Osborn, 30/-.

Concordia, St. Louis: *Luther's Works, Lectures on Genesis, Chapters 1-5,* ed. Jaroslav Pelikan.

Delachau & Niestle, Neuchatel and Paris: *La Confirmation,* Max Thurian, Fr. 4.50.

Eerdmans, Grand Rapids: *Faith and Perseverence,* G. C. Berkouwer, $4.00; *Edwards' Sermon Outlines,* ed. Sheldon B. Quiner, $2.50; *Jonathan Edwards on Evangelism,* ed. J. C. Wolf, $2.00; *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians,* R. V. G. Tasker, $3.00; *A Goodly Heritage,* by Marian M. Schoolland, $2.00; *Woman in the Church,* by Russell, C. Prohl, $2.00.

Inter-Varsity Fellowship, London: *Fundamentalism and the Word of* God, J. I. Packer, 4/6; *Authority,* D. Martyn Lloyd Jones, 3/-; *Why Believe?* A. Rendle Short, 3/-; *The Lord from Heaven,* Leon Morris, 4/-; *Christian Witness in the Home,* W. F. Batt, 9d.; *Unbelief to Faith,* 6d.

Macmillan, London: *Function, Purpose and Powers,* Dorothy Emmet, 46/6 (Aust.); *Religions,* D. W. Gundry, 26/6 (Aust.).

Marshall Morgan & Scott, London: *A New Heaven and a New Earth,* Archibald Hughes, 18/6 (Aust.).

Melbourne University Press, Melbourne: *The Independents in the English Civil War,* George Yule, 30/-.

S.C.M., London: *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister Stendahl, 35/-; *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, Joachim Jeremias, 7/6; *More New Testament Words*, William Barclay, 10/6; *Religious Language*, Ian T. Ramsey, 18/-; *The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform*, A. Allan McArthur, 25/-; *Revelation in Christ*, William Nicholls, 15/-; *Man's Estimate of Man*, F. H. Robertson, 8/6; *Calvin Commentaries*, ed. Joseph Haroutunian, 35/-; *Liturgical Renewal*, J. D. Benoit, 8/6; *Healing and Salvation*, Dorothee Hoch, 6/-; *The Kingdom of Christ*, Vols. 1 & 2, Frederick Denison Maurice, ed. Alec Vidler, 15/- each.

S.P.C.K., London: *Preaching the Cross*, J. C. Fenton, 7/6; *Conversations Between the Church of England and the Methodist Church: An Interim Statement*, 3/6; *New Testament Greek: An Introductory Grammar*, Eric G. Jay, 21/-.

Tyndale, London: *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, R. V. G. Tasker, 8/6; *The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem*, 2nd ed., and *The Building of the Second Temple*, 2nd ed., J. Stafford Wright, 1/6 each; *Moral Responsibility in Clinical Research*, D. MacG. Jackson, 6d.; *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, Leon Morris, 9/6.

JOURNALS RECEIVED

Biblica: Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus (Rome).
Biblical Theology (Belfast).
Bibliotheca Sacra (Dallas, Texas).
Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Manchester).
Canadian Journal of Theology (Toronto).
Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Washington).
Christian Quarterly (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma).
Churchman (London).
Church Quarterly Review (London).
Ecumenical Review (Geneva).
Ephemerides Carmeliticae (Rome).
Etudes Theologiques et Religieuses (Montpellier).
Evangelical Quarterly (London).
Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift (Kampen).
Indian Journal of Theology (Serampore).
Interpretation (Richmond, Virginia).
Lutherische Rundschau (Stuttgart).
Melita Theologica (Valletta).
New Testament Abstracts (Weston, Massachusetts).
Philosophy Today (Carthagena, Ohio).
Presbyterian World (Geneva).
Princeton Seminary Bulletin (Princeton, New Jersey).
Protestantesimo (Rome)
Religious and Theological Abstracts (Youngstown, Ohio).
Reformed Journal (Grand Rapids, Michigan).
Revista de Teologia (La Plata, Argentine).
Revue d' Historie et de Philosophie Religieuses (Strasbourg).
Revue Reformee (St.-Germain-en-Laye, Seine-et-Oise).
Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie (Lausanne).
Scottish Journal of Theology (Edinburgh).
Studia Theologica (Lund).
Theology Digest (Kansas City, Missouri).
Una Sancta (Augsburg).
Union Seminary Quarterly Review (New York).
Verbum Caro (Taize, Saone-et-Loire).

Book Reviews

Page

BLANKE, FRITZ: Hamann-Studien 83
By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, University of Otago.

HODGSON, LEONARD: For Faith and Freedom 83
By the Rev. Antony Snell, M.A., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafters, S.A.

JOCZ, JACOB: A Theology of Election 84
By the Rev. Professor G. A. F. Knight, M.A., B.D., Knox College, University of Otago.

McCAUGHEY, J. DAVIS: Christian Obedience in the University 85
By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafters, S.A.

ROBINSON, J. A. T.: Jesus and His Coming 86
By the Rev. Professor J. W. McCaughey, M.A., Ormond College, University of Melbourne.

SIMPSON, E. K. and F. F. BRUCE: Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians 87
By the Rev. D. W. B. Robinson, M.A., Moore Theological College, Sydney.

TAYLOR, VINCENT: The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching 88
By the Rev. R. Swanton, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

SHORTER NOTICES 89

BOOKS RECEIVED 94

JOURNALS RECEIVED 95

W. D. Vaughan Pty. Ltd. Print, 126-128 Denmark St., Kew.

NOV 1 0 1958